

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated August 18, 2009. Claims 1, 17, 26, 42, 47, 51 and 58 have been amended. Claims 22 and 45 have been canceled. Claims 19, 44, 56 and 57 were previously canceled. No new claims have been added. No new matter has been introduced by way of these amendments. In particular, the amendments to claims 1, 26, 51 and 58, incorporate subject matter from previously presented dependent claims, as discussed below. Also, claims 17, 42 and 47 have been rewritten in independent form, incorporating the subject matter of their base claims. Thus, claims 1-18, 20, 21, 23-43, 46-55 and 58-67 are currently pending.

Reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is thanked for allowing claims 63-67 and for indicating that claims 17-18, 20, 22, 42, 43, 45 and 47 are directed to allowable subject matter.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 15, 23, 24, 26, 27, 34, 35, 40, 48, 49, 51, 54, 55, 58, 59, 60 and 62 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aravind et al. (US Patent No. 5,214,507) in view of Balasubramanian et al. (Sequential Scalar Quantization of Vectors: An Analysis) further in view of Maeda et al. (US Patent No. 5,341,441) in further view of Matsumura et al. (US Patent No. 5,835,144). Claims 3-8, 13, 14, 321, 28-33, 38, 39, 46 and 53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aravind, Balasubramanian, Maeda, and Matsumura in further view of Cho et al. (US Patent No. 6,463,100). Claims 1, 12, 36, 37 and 61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aravind, Balasubramanian, Maeda, and Matsumura in further view of Cho and Lee (US Patent No. 5,731,836). Claims 16 and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aravind, Balasubramanian, Maeda, and Matsumura in further view of Stopler (US Patent No. 6,625,219). Claims 25 and 50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aravind, Balasubramanian, Maeda, and Matsumura in further view of De Haan et al. (US Patent No. 6,385,245). The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 as amended is substantially the same as claim 22 as presented in an Amendment filed November 8, 2007, and indicated as directed to allowable subject matter in the subsequent Office Action dated January 25, 2008.

Independent claim 17 as amended is substantially the same as claim 17 as presented in an Amendment filed November 8, 2007, and indicated as directed to allowable subject matter in the subsequent Office Action dated January 25, 2008.

Independent claim 26 as amended is substantially the same as claim 45 as presented in an Amendment filed November 8, 2007, and indicated as directed to allowable subject matter in the subsequent Office Action dated January 25, 2008.

Independent claim 42 as amended is substantially the same as claim 42 as presented in an Amendment filed November 8, 2007, and indicated as directed to allowable subject matter in the subsequent Office Action dated January 25, 2008.

Independent claim 47 as amended is substantially the same as claim 47 as presented in an Amendment filed November 8, 2007, and indicated as directed to allowable subject matter in the subsequent Office Action dated January 25, 2008.

Independent claim 51 as amended recites “wherein said video signals in said first format are signals generated according to a so-called Bayer pattern ...,” as previously presented in claims 22 and 47 and indicated as directed to allowable subject matter. In addition, claim 51 includes amendments reciting a “computer-readable memory medium,” made in response to a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph received in the Office Action dated February 4, 2009. *See*, Amendment dated May 4, 2009, pp. 12 and 17-18.

Independent claim 58 as amended recites “wherein said quantization step is determined according to at least one law chosen from the following: $m \cdot E_Q + q$; and $m \cdot (t^{\wedge} E_Q) + q$...,” as previously presented in claims 20 and 45 and indicated as directed to allowable subject matter.

Independent claim 63 was allowed in the Office Action dated August 18, 2009.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed independent claims 1, 17, 26, 42, 47, 51, 58 and 63 are allowable in view of the cited references. In addition, the dependent claims are believed to be allowable at least by virtue of their dependencies.

The Director is authorized to charge any additional fees due by way of this Amendment, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 19-1090.

All of the claims remaining in the application are now clearly allowable. Favorable consideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
SEED Intellectual Property Law Group PLLC

/Timothy L. Boller/
Timothy L. Boller
Registration No. 47,435

TLB:BRD:jrh

701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 5400
Seattle, Washington 98104
Phone: (206) 622-4900
Fax: (206) 682-6031

1452329_1.DOC